

**The Washington Herald**

PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING BY  
THE WASHINGTON HERALD COMPANY  
1222 New York Avenue. Telephone MAIN 2390.

CLINTON T. BRAINARD, President and Editor.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., REPRESENTATIVE  
C. K. ABBOT. Guarantee Trust Bldg.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES BY CARRIER:  
Daily and Sunday.....45 cents per month  
Daily and Sunday.....\$5.40 per year  
Daily, without Sunday.....35 cents per month  
Daily, without Sunday.....\$4.20 per year  
Entered at the postoffice at Washington, D. C., as second-class mail matter.

SUNDAY, APRIL 4, 1915.

## A Line o' Cheer Each Day o' the Year.

By JOHN KENDRICK BANGS.

First printing of an original poem, written daily for The Washington Herald.

**OPPORTUNITY.**

Now Opportunity, they say,  
Comes once and knocks and goes for aye—  
Which is not true, for good old Opp  
Has more than one knock in his shoe.  
In fact I glanced one day within it,  
And found he'd one for every minute,  
And maybe if with care I reckoned  
I'd find he'd one for every second.  
Which you and I could plainly hear  
If we'd but grant him half an ear.

(Copyright, 1915.)

It will be easy to forget yesterday if the sun shines today.

Just imagine what a transformation a couple of hours of April sunshine can produce.

Agents of the Argentine are buying hardwood in this country, but no decrease in our supply of blockheads is noticeable.

A Western woman advertises for a new husband, able and willing to kick out of the house the one from whom she has been divorced, but who refuses to move. The chances are any one applying would have to fight two.

Unitarians are planning to bring William Howard Taft and Charles W. Eliot to Paterson, N. J., to refute the attacks of Billy Sunday on their religion; but perhaps these two distinguished scholars are not yet candidates for a vaudeville competition.

The recent occasion of the Bismarck centenary seems to have opened fresh theological vistas to the Kaiser. "We shall succeed. Our guarantee is, firstly, God's grace," he wired from headquarters to the almost equally devout imperial chancellor in Berlin. Nothing at all about calling off the war dogs in that message.

London, after getting almost excited, now reports that the United States note protesting against the allies' blockade is altogether friendly in tone. It will be noted that the press of this country never suggested anything to the contrary. In one instance at least the other side seems to have monopolized yellow journalism.

The elasticity of imagination long accredited to the American interviewer seems to have passed into the possession of the French. To achieve the distinction of having one's account of an interview repudiated by the President of the United States is something which M. Gabriel Alphonse, of the Paris Temps, may hand down to his posterity.

It would perhaps be interesting to know the real reason for delaying until next Wednesday publication of the text of the United States protest against the blockade established by the allies. The delay seems to have been instigated by the British foreign office, which makes the Easter holidays the excuse. The reason is probably more closely connected with diplomacy than Easter.

Chancellor Lloyd George's arraignment of the British nation for confirmed inebriety seems to have occasioned great surprise all over the empire. Not even Lord Kitchener's corroboration of the charge has served to allay the storm of astonished protest. Strange, isn't it, in view of the fact that we have known all about it ever and ever so long on this side?

"Germany's edifice is not yet collapsing, but it has begun to crack," declares the Paris Temps. If cracks were a reliable indication of speedy downfall most of the venerable European architectural relics which have been on exhibition from time immemorial have tumbled long ago. Cracks do not presage certain collapse. How about that Rheims cathedral, Monsieur Temps?

"That man is not a general," declared King Albert of Belgium, speaking of Sir John French. "He is a magician." In order to live up to his reputation, it will be necessary for Sir John to work some mighty changes in the Western European battle line within a few weeks. With an available force of 4,000,000 allies now on the western front, there should be some opportunity for Sir John to perform his star trick before long.

Whatever may be the popular opinion as to the actual value of Dr. Dernburg as an apologist for the Kaiser in this country, it must be admitted that if he has not fallen into error concerning the American capacity for gullibility he is endowed with considerable personal courage. To attempt the justification of the sinking of the Falaba after the German method presupposes a confidence in the temper of the general public which verges on the heroic. And that is what the doctor seems to be trying to do.

Without any special effort on our part, and practically in spite of ourselves, we are acquiring such a vital interest in European affairs as we have never before had reason to feel. This comes from our rapidly accumulating investment in European indebtedness. It marks our transformation from a borrowing nation into a lending one, and hereafter we must be regarded as an international financial factor of prime importance. It is a position long coveted by some of our leading financiers, and now that it has come unsought and almost unheralded what are we going to do with it?

## Political Situation.

Theodore Roosevelt has determined to prevent a Democratic administration from succeeding itself; Senator Borah, of Idaho, is to eliminate himself from the Republican Presidential race; and Secretary Bryan hopes to step from the Cabinet into the Senate to occupy the seat now held by Senator Hitchcock.

These are the most interesting and important of the many political developments of the week.

Mr. Roosevelt's position can be outlined with emphasis and accuracy. He believes, first of all, that the present Democratic administration has worked incalculable damage to the country and that its continuance would mean universal distress. He regards the foreign policy of the administration, to use his own words, as criminal, and he includes in this characterization the disregard of the administration for adequate military and naval defense. The language in which he condemns President Wilson's handling of the Mexican situation is most vigorous. He has personal knowledge of the great suffering which exists in New York among the thousands of unemployed people and he naturally blames the Democrats for causing idleness through business stagnation. His indictment against the party in power is as long as the moral law.

It may be that the spirit of repentance has entered Roosevelt's soul and that he is determined to make atonement for conditions for which he, more than any one else, is responsible. Be this as it may, there is no doubt of his present attitude. More than this, he will relegate himself into the background if by so doing he can accomplish his purpose.

And self-effacement means much to Roosevelt. He would rather lead than follow. When he voluntarily admits, as he does, that he might interfere with Democratic defeat if he stepped out into the limelight again, the sincerity of his desire is apparent. He realizes that his action in 1912 alienated from him thousands of Republicans and he fears that if he should now attempt to secure the Presidential nomination it would split the party again. Too much water, to use his own expressive phrase, has gone under the bridge. So he is ready and willing to support the nominee of the Republican party and says that he believes that he can bring back the remaining members of the Progressive party who are still loyal to him.

Support the Republican nominee! Kill the fatted calf, for the prodigal son is about to return! Mr. Roosevelt has shown that he can execute a somersault more frequently and successfully than any other person in the world. If the campaign next year shall find him back in the Republican ranks—as it undoubtedly will—the spectacle will be typically Rooseveltian. The truth is, however, that his support will be gladly welcomed and it will make Republican victory certain. With all factions united in the common determination to oust the Democrats there can be no doubt as to the outcome.

As to candidates, Mr. Roosevelt has his preferences, of course, but he refers to all of them with considerable generosity of expression. At the same time—and the fact may not be without its significance—he mingles words of criticism with language of praise. For instance, he regards Mr. Root as the ablest man in public life today and would support him, but doubts if his nomination would be wise, owing to Mr. Root's lifelong identification with corporate interests. He commends Senator Burton's wisdom and experience, but questions whether he has physical vigor sufficient to enable him to stand the strain. He objects to Mr. Taft not altogether on personal grounds but because Mr. Taft has publicly supported and endorsed the foreign policy of the administration. Without going into detail it may be said that Mr. Roosevelt finds a fly in every drop of ointment, so to speak, that is offered for his inspection.

Cynical people might suspect that these expressions indicate a belief in Mr. Roosevelt's own mind that, after all, he is possibly the most available candidate.

The prediction is made, however, that the future will demonstrate this point of view to be incorrect. Mr. Roosevelt is sincere in saying that he cannot—and ought not—to be regarded as a candidate. Viewed in the light of the present situation there is only one condition under which his name can be considered. The present administration is publicly committed by the utterances of Secretary Bryan to the policy of peace at any price. We are not going to intervene in Mexico, though the American flag is insulted or Americans murdered or American property destroyed. No matter what happens in other parts of the world we will content ourselves with beautifully written protests. The time may come when there will be a popular reaction against a supine policy and when the American people will demand a little more of the big stick idea. Should this be the case, somebody might casually suggest the necessity of a strong man in the White House and the name of Roosevelt would instinctively arise in everybody's mind.

This, however, is for the future to decide. In the meantime, the numerous Republican candidates are not letting the grass grow under their feet.

There will be one less candidate in the race when a statement which Senator Borah, of Idaho, is preparing is made public. Mr. Borah will state that he does not regard himself as a candidate but he will take occasion to utter a warning to his fellow Republicans not to get too far away from the progressive idea. Whether he regards Mr. Root and Mr. Fairbanks as examples of the reactionary class he does not say, but there is no doubt that his point of view has considerable merit. As to his withdrawal from the race, perhaps he is making a virtue of necessity. It is hardly likely that the Republican party will ever nominate for the Presidency a man who voted for Bryan and free silver in 1896 nor elevate Idaho, with its three electoral votes, to the dignity of a pivotal State. It is a pity that Senator Borah is thus handicapped. He is a man of acknowledged ability, is much favored by Roosevelt, has been thoroughly progressive in all his ideas, and yet did not desert the Republican party.

Senator Burton has admitted that he is a candidate, Senator Weeks has started on a swing around the circle, Senator Cummins is organizing his campaign and the friends of former Senator Root are working industriously. Mr. Root, however, insists that his name must not be considered and his positive statement, coupled with the fact that he is 70 years of age, puts him unfortunately out of the race. He would make a great President. Mr. Fairbanks is also active, but should be ever develop strength some chapters in his career would be resurrected and might cause him embarrassment.

The main reason for the sudden activities on the part of the Republican candidates is the fact, privately made known by Mr. Roosevelt, that he can be relied upon to co-operate in securing the overthrow of the Democratic administration. A very large proportion of the Progressives have already returned to their former allegiance, but as long as the position of Mr. Roosevelt remained unknown there was doubt in the political atmosphere. This has now been removed. Mr. Roosevelt is for any man who can beat President Wilson and the Democrats will have to enter the campaign with this fact staring them in the face.

## Speeding Up the Death Rate.

Old fashioned revivalism has been revived by others than Billy Sunday. One of the most fashionable churches in Washington has, on its walls, a large poster announcing that one adult death from alcohol occurs every eight minutes in this country. The pastor of that church is a scholar, a student, a traveler, and a preacher whose sermons are instructive as to the progress of the world as it is, as well as regarding the future life of man. If the pastor should make such an announcement in his sermon, it would be accepted as a statement based on some careful investigation. But a flaming poster on the walls of a church means little more to the public than the advertising posters on dead walls about the city or big signs along the country road.

The old-time preacher often reminded his congregation that life is fleeting and a sinner died every second. So it might be said today when more is done to combat disease and death than in any other age of the world. We have in the United States the lowest death rate in the world with the exception of Australia and New Zealand, and it is lower now than it has ever been, but death is a part of the law of the universe, and it has ceased to be a part of evangelistic work to dwell on the subject. The interesting part of the church poster is the particular cause of a death every eight minutes. The United States Census Bureau has tried to collect reliable statistics on this subject for some years, and by co-operating with the more advanced States, it has succeeded in collecting much interesting data from an area which supports about two-thirds of the population of the United States. In this registered area, in 1912, there were 832,250 deaths which would give more than 1,200,000 deaths for the whole country if the death rate outside the registered area were the same as that in that area.

These 832,250 deaths were not all adults nor all from what are called preventable causes. There were 204,000 of children under five years old, and 227,000 of people who had passed the age of 65. This would leave 356,000 deaths of adults between the ages of 20 and 65, a large number it is true, but it appears from the census statistics that we have not yet conquered the dread disease of tuberculosis which claimed 90,000 victims, nor cancer which took 46,000 lives, while organic heart disease was credited with 86,000, pneumonia 42,500, diabetes 30,000, accidents 20,000, suicide 10,000, homicide 4,000 and many other diseases and causes, besides old age claiming its part of the grim harvest. The result might be figured out in minutes or even seconds, to make the situation appear more ghastly, but the disposition has been to show the improvement and the success in fighting disease and death by sanitation and better methods of living as well as by the scientific study of disease. It has been left to those who work in the cause of temperance to employ the old method of exaggeration in the harvest of death.

It would be a cause for serious thought if in this country under present conditions one adult died every eight minutes from the use of alcohol for that would mean 65,700 deaths a year from alcoholism instead of 3,183 as given by the mortality statistics for 1912, published by the United States Census Bureau. An exaggeration of 2,000 per cent in statistics of this kind may appear excusable to a man like Capt. Hobson, but if the learned and carefully conservative pastor of this fashionable church in Washington should become so reckless in his sermon, say in referring to the Disciples as 240 in number instead of 12, some one would take notice of his eccentricity. But while the statements of historical fact uttered in the pulpit must be reliable the walls of the church may be blazoned with patent untruths and cause little comment. It is a question of ethics, perhaps, but why should not the exterior of the church stand for truth as does the interior? The church ought to be a monument to truth.

**If He Were a Battleship.**

Col. Roosevelt keeps exuberantly at it, telling how the affairs of the nation ought to be managed, just as if he had forgotten the people had a new manager on the job. If the Colonel were a British battleship, they would undoubtedly christen him the Indefatigable.—St. Louis Post Dispatch.

**Huerta's Return.**

More singular things have happened than the acceptance of Gen. Victoriano Huerta by the people of Mexico, disgusted and discouraged by the brawling of the patriots who were pledged to establish a stable reform government in Mexico. From the vantage point of one of the West Indies Huerta, who is said to have taken ship for America, could wait for the psychological moment.—New York Sun.

**When the War Will End.**

Wall Street's judgment as to the duration of the war is supported by no less a personage than James J. Hill. The trouble will end in October, 1915, unless both sides are prepared to fight through the spring and summer of 1916." By the same token, it will be in order presently to say that the war will end in 1916, unless both sides are prepared to fight through the spring and summer of 1917. It is easier to guess prices than it is to forecast the end of war.—New York World.

**Physicians' Incomes.**

Dr. S. Weir Mitchell was known nationally, even internationally, as a man of medicine. He was known nationally and over a good part of the world as a writer of fiction.

He had been famous many years and lived well beyond 80 and yet his estate inventories at a little under \$500,000. No other American since Oliver Wendell Holmes was so eminent as Dr. Mitchell in both science and literature, but these high attainments of his big brain didn't earn as much money for him as hundreds of Americans who have little education earn by business.

Dr. Horatio C. Wood once told me that Dr. Mitchell's medical practice was then worth \$500,000 a year. He said one other Philadelphia physician was earning as much.

I am told by doctors who ought to be in a position to form a pretty correct guess that at least one surgeon in the city today makes considerably over \$50,000 a year.

Carnegie had the correct dose, however, when he said that no man could grow very rich except through the labor of many other men. Professional men's incomes are derived solely by their own exertions. Girard, in Philadelphia, Public Ledger.

## How Prinz Eitel Friedrich May Elude Enemy Ships

Marine men who have studied the waters outside the Virginia capes say that the Prinz Eitel Friedrich, if she attempted to run to the northward, would not have to run out as far as the Cape Charles lightship, but on her draft could pass inside South Shoal, within half a mile of the water.

From Cape Henlopen northward the only question would involve passing inside McTear's Shoal. This could be done, but the question is whether it would be exceeded unless the British cruisers considered the waters of the Delaware extended to the Five Fathoms Bank Shoal.

The British cruisers stationed off New York are regarding, it is said, the Ambrose lightship as marking the land limit of New York, and are keeping a close watch on the water.

Just at this time when the Prinz Eitel is expected to make a dash the strain on board the battleships, it is said by marine men, must be very great. The commanders of the British cruisers cannot exactly explain away any escape of the German ship short of a blockade.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

When one considers the methods resorted to by blockade runners during the civil war in the United States marine men here say that the Prinz Eitel would have an excellent chance of breaking through the British cordon by merely bugging the coast until an opening offered itself. The blockade runners out of Wilmington, N. C., during the war, did this to the most complete advantage.

## THE OPEN FORUM

Herald Readers Discuss the Question of the Married School Teachers.

Editor of the Washington Herald:

The ladies of the several clubs of this city have espoused with such vigor the cause of the female married teacher that I am, of course, supposed to be in behalf of the man—mere man, to be sure—through whom the teacher may become married.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

may reap the benefits of their hard labor, and their parents' sacrifices by securing schools, but I am unalterably opposed to being taxed one cent to pay salaries to those women who draw salaries in the marriage lottery, and who are now willing to publicly acknowledge that their husbands are destitute of all manhood and chivalry—too lazy and worthless to support the wives they profess to love. If the women want extra money, why do they not let it be known by advertising that they will teach in their own homes, those persons who wish a better education, and not attempt to wretch from the girls their means of self-support?

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at all. She will have to leave the school if she marries. If it is her suggestion, then there is little likelihood of a home in its truest sense, if she is not willing to begin with the man who she will have to leave the school if she marries.

One of the pleas brought forward in favor of repeal of the rule in question is that many young teachers about to marry have been told by their superiors that they will have to leave the school if they marry. Why? Do they not know better engagement whether or not the man is not only able to, but willing to support them? If they marry? Whom? The suggestion that she shall work after marriage? If his, then she should not marry, because if she does, with that understanding she might as well not work at